

PATENT

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 remain pending in the application. Applicant has amended the specification section entitled, "Related Applications," by way of replacement paragraph in order to replace the term, "TBD", with Applicant's now issued parent-case patent number, i.e. 6,683,044. Applicant further has amended claims 1, 6, 11, and 19 in order to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of Applicant's invention. No new matter is added by way of the amendments, at least because support for same may be found in the specification at page 17.

It is noted that Para. 9 of the Official Action sets forth considerations of joint inventorship not relevant in the current application for the reason that the instant application names a sole inventor. This is best seen with reference to the sole inventor's declaration of record. Accordingly, any consideration of the effect of joint inventorship is irrelevant. Furthermore, it does not appear that any of the references is available only under 35 U.S.C. 102(a).

In accordance with the amendments to the claims, Applicant has more specifically set forth the recited limitation, more particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter of Applicant's invention; to wit, that said bubble, when formed, is structurally defined for floating in integral form for a period of time through the

PATENT

air. This characteristic is not known or seen to be present in the prior art, as discussed more fully below.

For example, a bubble formed in accordance with Applicant's invention materially differs from the subject matter disclosed in the Brittin *et al.* '256 reference. As best understood by Applicant, Brittin *et al.* defines a carbon dioxide bubble (or a plurality thereof) which is bubbled through a liquid. The bubbles are not structurally cohesive as defined in applicant's invention and collapse upon meeting the liquid surface or, at best, would provide a foam upon the liquid surface. In either such event, collapse of a carbon dioxide bubble of the Brittin *et al.* device merely provides a carbon dioxide-rich gaseous envelope above the liquid for attracting insects into contact with the liquid, whereupon they drown. By contrast, applicant's bubble is formed as by blowing a child's play bubble, for release into the air, whereupon it floats "downwind" for such a period of time upon air currents and through the air until it finally collapses and disperses the animal attractant in atomized form through the air. Brittin *et al.* does not contemplate such structure, bubble longevity, or purpose. Rather, Britton *et al.* contemplates that the carbon dioxide bubble collapses immediately and forms a gaseous blanket above the liquid surface for attracting insects thereto. Applicant's invention, on the other hand, dissociates the bubble and its carried attractant from the locus of creation, and carries the attractant in bubble form upon the air for a distance and time, thereby displacing the attractant from the locus of creation. Applicant's invention is, thereby, uniquely structurally enabled to carry out this important difference.

PATENT

Similarly, as best understood by Applicant, the device of Miller et al. '403 is a sprayer device for disbursing a droplet-carried spray of liquid attractant through the air. As contrasted with applicant's invention, whereby an integral bubble (i.e., a gas-filled structure) is disbursed through the air carrying an attractant, Miller et al. teaches use of a compressed gas propellant to disburse a liquid-droplet attractant through the air. This is a clear structural and inventive difference not shown by Miller et al., nor by any reference of record.

Although animal estrous attractants are known, e.g., Bell '342, no known reference teaches the combination of structural features claimed by Applicant, nor taught in the methods thereof, nor are the advantages of same hinted at in the known prior art.

It is respectfully noted that a supplemental IDS will be filed under separate cover for consideration by the Examiner. The Examiner's comments regarding the earlier filed IDS are noted with appreciation.

PATENT

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, which add no new matter, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any questions, she is invited to contact the undersigned counsel at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

/George P. Bonanto/

George P. Bonanto
Reg. No. 59,717

Myers & Kaplan,
Intellectual Property Law, L.L.C.
3100 Cumberland Blvd.,
Suite 1400
Atlanta, GA 30339
(770) 541-7444
(770) 541-7448 facsimile